

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 42, and 44-49 are pending. Claims 24-30 and claim 43 are cancelled herein. Independent claims 1 and 2 are amended herein to include the limitations of claim 43, which is thus cancelled. Claim 46 is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1 prior to the present amendment. Claim 49 is new and includes all of the limitations of claim 2 and claim 46 prior to the present amendment. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 43 has been cancelled, and claim 46 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim in order to overcome the objections to the claims. Applicants thus respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 43 and 46.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

The Examiner asserted that claims 1, 2, 7-12, 24, 26-30, 44 and 45 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kamiguchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,495,275) in view of Sugawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,828,039), Sugawara (U.S. Patent App. No. 2004/0052008 A1), and Fujiwara et al. (U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0054461 A1).

The Examiner also asserted that Claims 3, 4, and 42 are unpatentable over Kamiguchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,495,275) in view of Sugawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,828,039), Sugawara (U.S. Patent App. No. 2004/0052008 A1), and Fujiwara et al. (U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0054461 A1), and further in view of Mack et al. (U.S. Patent 6,462,919).

Examiner further asserted that Claims 5 and 6 are unpatentable over Kamiguchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,495,275) in view of Sugawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,828,039), Sugawara (U.S. Patent App. No. 2004/0052008 A1), and Fujiwara et al. (U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0054461 A1), and further in view of Kishi et al. (U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0191451 A1).

Applicants respectfully disagree in view of the amendments herein to independent claims 1 and 2. Claims 3-12, 42, and 44-45 depend from claim 1 or 2. (Claims 24 and 26-30 have been cancelled.)

As amended, claims 1 and 2 recite, *inter alia*, that a thickness of the current limiting layer is smaller than a particle size of the conductive particles. This limitation was originally recited in claim 43, which was found to be allowable in the prior Office action except for its dependence on a rejected base claim. Applicants therefore submit that independent claims 1 and 2 and the claims depending therefrom are allowable, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Patentability of New Claim 49

Claim 49 is new and includes all of the limitations of claim 2 and claim 46 prior to the present amendment. Claim 46 was found to be allowable in the prior Office action except for its dependence on a rejected base claim. Applicants therefore submit that claim 49 is patentable over the prior art of record and respectfully request allowance of this claim.


Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's allowance of claims 47 and 48.

Summary

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested. If for any reason, however, the Examiner feels that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200